

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In this amendment, claims 1, 2 and 12 are amended. The amendment of claims 1 and 2 is supported by original claim 8; and the amendment of claim 12 is supported by original claims 17 and 18. No new matter is introduced. Claims 8 and 17-21 are cancelled without prejudice. Applicants respectfully request favourable reconsideration.

Priority

The Applicants request the Examiner to clarify the statements in item 2 of the Office Action. Is the Examiner aware of a potential interference in relation to the pending application?

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-21 under Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Goldberg (U.S. Pat. 7,093,193). The Office Action (items 26-29) appears to reject claims 1, 12, and 19, presumably under Section 102, as being anticipated by the “applicant admitted prior art (AAPA),” which includes Figs. 1-3 of the specification.

Neither Goldberg nor AAPA teaches or suggests that the index file (the first index data and/or the second index data) is stored in the database as an array or a linking list. Goldberg and AAPA also fail to teach or suggest that the index file (the first index data and/or the second index data) is referred to according to the filename of the web page and the file allocation table associated with an operating system of the server. The cited descriptions in Goldberg’s column 3, lines 23-30 and column 4, lines 60-63 only disclose the memory location of argument variables that can be stored in memory, but fail to disclose how to store and read the desired information. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under Section 102 and submit that the present invention is patentable over the cited references.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Office Action rejected claim 11 under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg in view of Lieberman (U.S. Pat. 6,516,349). The Lieberman patent was cited for the purpose of disclosing the server-side command constructed by Server Side Includes (SSI),

Command Gateway Interface (CGI), Active Server Pages (ASP), or Perl Hypertext Processor (PHP). Because claim 11 depends from claim 1, it incorporates the elements of claim 1 which are not disclosed by Goldberg, discussed above. The Lieberman patent, likewise, fails to disclose the missing claim elements. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 would not have been obvious from the combination of Goldberg and Lieberman and request withdrawal of the rejection under Section 103.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Evan R. Witt/

Evan R. Witt
Reg. No. 32,512
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Date: February 1, 2008
KIRTON & McCONKIE
1800 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: 801/328-3600

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0843.
--